The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the Proceedings in Chambers, dated Fri 20 Dec 46.

3

Greenberg & Sprat

The proceeding was resumed, pursuant to adjournment, at 0900.

MR. BLEWETT: Can we continue the discussion, your Honor?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Mr. Blewett. I would like to listen.

MR. BLEWETT: This matter has not been brought up by one person; the whole group has discussed this for several months and at many meetings, and there was not unanimity in the meetings. One of the groups took the stand that by right they could make this motion and that the Court, of course, could determine whether or not an argument should be heard. But the fact of the motion itself was assumed from our practice at home. I do not know whether it is the rules of Court or whether it is the rules of procedure.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, subject to what the Charter says, yes.

MR. BLEWETT: We would just simply, naturally, take it for granted.

THE PRESIDENT: If the Charter denies it expressedly or impliedly, of course, then it could not be taken for granted.

MR. BLEWETT: If we can assume that we have

something to prepare our case after the prosecution's case is over, why, I shall abide by the Court's decision.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know what the

Judges think at all on that, but I feel sure that
ther will be no time granted for that purpose. If
it involves the Judges postponing their sitting or
taking a vacation, or something like that, it would
not be granted. It is just my feeling. The trial
is going to take far longer than we anticipated.

We have not wasted any time. I think, as a matter
of fact, that if this trial were conducted wholly in
English, it would constitute a high-speed record.

Already we have taken far more evidence than
Nuernberg took in the same time.

MR. McMANUS: If your Honor, pleases, prosecution --

THE PRESIDENT: Nevertheless, we hope to finish this trial early next year, without prejudice to the fair trial of the accused.

MR. McMANUS: I am not thinking about the expediency of the trial. I am thinking about a proper and fair defense that should be placed befor this Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I have been conducting

something to prepare our case after the prosecution's case is over, why, I shall abide by the Court's decision.

Judges think at all on that, but I feel sure that ther will be no time granted for that purpose. If it involves the Judges postponing their sitting or taking a vacation, or something like that, it would not be granted. It is just my feeling. The trial is going to take far longer than we anticipated. We have not wasted any time. I think, as a matter of fact, that if this trial were conducted wholly in English, it would constitute a high-speed record. Already we have taken far more evidence than Nuernberg took in the same time.

MR. McMANUS: If your Honor pleases, prosecution --

THE PRESIDENT: Nevertheless, we hope to finish this trial early next year, without prejudice to the fair trial of the accused.

MR. McMANUS: I am not thinking about the expediency of the trial. I am thinking about a proper and fair defense that should be placed befor this Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I have been conducting

is all that is to be considered on this motion. What we might do on our case has no place in this discussion.

MR. LEVIN: I am certainly in accord with Mr. Logan. There can be no question about that as I indicated. The prosecution was not concerned with our motions exactly in the same form as we might make a motion and objection to the evidence, or "the question is leading". It is a matter of criminal procedure in a trial of criminal action.

about moving a Court to, say, dismiss the case on the ground that there is no evidence. Of course, if you do not take up that stand, and you call the accused, or if the Court is against it, and then you call an accused, the evidence can be supplied by the accused. But a party making a motion of that kind generally stands on it.

MR. BLEWETT: We do not put any defense at all. Of course, we have an appellate right there, naturally, which we do not have here.

THE PRESIDENT: That question has come before the English Courts in several cases, and Raydon
is one, and there is some variety of opinion. It is
not as clear as day. I do not express any opinion on

is all that is to be considered on this motion. What we might do on our case has no place in this discussion.

MR. LEVIN: I am certainly in accord with Mr. Logan. There can be no question about that as I indicated. The prosecution was not concerned with our motions exactly in the same form as we might make a motion and objection to the evidence, or "the question is leading". It is a matter of criminal procedure in a trial of criminal action.

about moving a Court to, say, dismiss the case on the ground that there is no evidence. Of course, if you do not take up that stand, and you call the accused, or if the Court is against it, and then you call an accused, the evidence can be supplied by the accused. But a party making a motion of that kind generally stands on it.

MR. BLEWETT: We do not put any defense at all. Of course, we have an appellate right there, naturally, which we do not have here.

THE PRESIDENT: That question has come before the English Courts in several cases, and Raydon
is one, and there is some variety of opinion. It is
not as clear as day. I do not express any opinion on

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the Proceedings in Chambers, dated Wed 18 Dec 46.

15

THE PRESIDENT: Have you information that he was misrepresenting the Japanese attitude to the Germans?

MR. CAUDLE: At least our clients.

THE PRESIDENT: Did you get that information from Stammer?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I got mine out of the Foreign Office.

THE PRESIDENT: From whom?

MR. CAUDLE: The Japanese Foreign Office.

THE PRESIDENT: Which man?

MR. CAUDLE: Mr. OTA.

THE PRESIDENT: Will you give that evidence?

MR. CAUDLE: He says that it was the rumor

going round. I won't make a general statement.

THE PRESIDENT: What does Stammer say?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Stammer says he was sent here by Ribbentrop because the stories between Ott and the ambassador to Germany were so inconsistent that he wanted to get a true story from Tokyo, and Ribbentrop told me the same thing.

THE PRESIDENT: That would suggest that Ott was misleading the German government.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Ott was misleading his

The attached pages: are coirected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the Proceedings in Chambers, dated Thu 19 Dec 46.

8

the court would require him to go to the box so that he could be examined by Members of the Tribunal. I do not know. I do not know what my colleagues feel about that. You see, different nations have different ways. In some nations a court takes a bigger part than the British or American courts, or British and Russian.

MR. LEVIN: It doesn't --

MR. BROOKS: While you are on that, your Honor; as I recall from reading earlier that it is borne in case the accused does not take the witness stand that the court can comment on that which is unusual. According to our courts the court does not comment and the witness will refuse to take the stand.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: Refuse to answer, yes, sir.

MR. BROOKS: I know there is something in there.

MR. TAVENNER: If they live.

THE PRESIDENT: I wouldn't decide any of these questions of course without consulting the other Members.

MR. TAVENNER: May I point out to you one further consideration in regard to it? I find on examining the Charter that was issued by SCAP on

procedure as to whether or not the Court would feel that it would be granting the accused an expeditious trial in dealing with such motions because if the issues can be narrowed, if the prosecution has failed to prove its case on certain counts, they should be stricken, because, after all, the burden has been on the prosecution right along in the case and that, if, when prosecution finishes its case and there is no evidence or slight evidence, and the Court feels that the case should be dismissed as to certain accused on certain points, that should be done. It is merely a procedural matter. It is not affecting a substantial right of the prosecution, and, I think, the Court in its inherent power would have a right to entertain such motions even though it is not specifically granted in the Charter. Certainly it is a right that all Englishspeaking nations recognize and insofar as requiring the accused to take the stand.

THE PRESIDENT: There is only one charge there is ordinarily only one count in an indictment.
There may, in certain special cases, be more than
one; therefore, you deal with the whole lot at once.
But here there are fifty-five.

MR. LOGAN: Which makes it different from other counts.

there is no evidence but the trial goes ahead and the accused give evidence on the others, and, of course, when they give evidence they may supply evidence on the other counts upon which the prosecution have failed to give evidence. Then what do you do? Then the men are clearly guilty on the whole evidence, but I would say it would be useless to try to deal with them because you have struck out the counts on which there was no evidence when the prosecution finished. The position is somewhat different in a national court where there is only the one charge substantially. Duplicity is not allowed except in special cases where one crime is really part of another.

MR. LOGAN: Well, it may even be, your Honor, that prosecution has failed to prove any count as to certain defendants and why should they be held required to put therein proof. I am speaking now of all counts.

THE PRESIDENT: Very often accused giving evidence supplies evidence against himself where the prosecution has failed to do so. He may be cross-examined into making admissions which supply something lacking in the prosecution's case.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President --

THE PRESIDENT: Now, I should say a defendant

Perhaps you should ask us to stand this witness down, as you did before, Mr. Logan.

on this affidavit, if your Honor please. I don't think there can be any presumption, if the Tribunal please, that these documents were deliberately burnt in view of the statement in this affidavit, and I think the mere statement they were burnt properly answers the absence of the documents, and that is all we have been asked to do.

THE PRESIDENT: These are matters of vital importance. We are not insisting upon the observance of the strict technical rule, rerely.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 100, after which the proceedingings were resumed as follows:)

NOIL:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the correspinding pages in the record.

LI

SI

έI

on the usual terms?

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

13 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

THE FRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. (Whereupon the witness was excused.)

LR. ROBERTS: "e offer in evidence defense document 1131, which is a statement emanating from the Foreign Office concerning the attempt on the part of Chinese censors to manipulate dispatches of foreign correspondents and is intended to correct the distortion of facts by the Chirose censors.

THE FRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, we object to document 1131. It is, we submit, a press dispatch of a kind that has been rejected on numerous occasions by the Tribunal. It purports to say what was in a dispatch and how it was altered by the censors.

IR. ROBERTS: I think this press dispatch objection is being slightly overused by the prosecution.

TWE PRESIDENT: Press release.

1R. ROBERTS: Press release.

The certificate states it to be an exact and true copy of an official document of the Japanese Foreign Office, and it states certain facts with reference to bombing of the Sincere Department Store.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Tribunal upholds the objection and rejects the document. It is too late now to take any other business tucay. we will adjourn now until helf past nine Morday neyt. (Whereupon, at 1555, an adjournment was taken until Honday, 5 May 1947, at 0930.)

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Tribunal upholds the objection and rejects the document. It is too late now to take any other business tuday. We will adjourn now until half past nine Morday next. (Whereupon, at 1555, an adjournment was taken until Honday, 5 May 1947, at 0930.)

NOLL:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

23,017

HATTORI

DIRECT

subordinate units of the Army or some other subject, 1 when a telegram was forwarded from the Headquarters 2 of the Army by the one in charge." 3 MR. BLAKENEY: Shall I omit the reading 4 of the telegram? 5 THE PRESIDENT: No, you can go on with the 6 next sentence. 7 MR. BIAKENEY: (Reading) 8 "This telegram was a confidential telegram 9 from the Commander of the 23d Division (Hailar 10 Defense Commander) to the Commander of the Kwantung 11 Army." 12 THE PRESIDENT: That is where you stop. 13 MR. BLAKENEY: Next paragraph. 14 THE PRESIDENT: No, you still have a 15 sentence in that paragraph. 16 MR. BIAKENEY: Well, that is part of the 17 contents of the telegram, of course. 18 THE PRESIDENT: I do not think it is. It 19 20

23 24

21

22

whalen & Selzer

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far Fast is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: I refer to page 23,017 of the record. As lines 12 to 18 inclusive were not in evidence that part of the exhibit was not read and should not appear in the transcript.

All of the accused are present except the accused TOJO, who, with the Court's permission, is interviewing his counsel outside the court room.

Colonel Smirnov.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Thank you, your Honor.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RIPPEI OGISU, culled as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters, as follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY COLONEL SMIRNOV: (Continued)

- Q From what post were you transferred to the post of the Commander of the 6th Army?
- A I was transferred from my former position as Chief of the 13th Division in Central China to be Commander of the 6th Army in Manchuria.
 - Q If we shall believe the list of your career

called the Arshan-Col River.

IR. BIAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, I think whatever demonstration the witness is raking should also be made to the bench.

THE PRISIDENT: There is no need for him to point out any name. He can read the name, and he can underline it, if necessary.

MR. BIAKENEY: Unless the prosecution is willing to concede that the difference pointed out by the witness exists, I think I must insist that it be shown to the Tribunal if it is going to be a matter in dispute.

THE PRESIDENT: If you think we will be better informed as a result, let us see that. He said there was a difference in words. Let him point out the words. What more can be do?

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I intended to ask the same, but a little later on; but previous to the time the map is shown to the bench I would like to ask your direction to determine the names of the places through which the border line passes according to the agreement between Molotov and TOGO.

THE PRESIDENT: One difficulty at a time.

That is another matter entirely. Let us clear up this point about the alleged difference between the maps.

1 2

I remind you. I quote the second part of
the document, second page of the English text. I quote:
 "There must be many essentials for carrying
out war against the Soviet Union, but the following
are the most important.

"1. Necessity of Annihilating the Enemy.

a lightning war in view of its situation. But the far eastern territory of the Soviet Union is very far from its political and industrial centre, and Japan cannot extinguish the enemy altogether by mere occupation of that territory. Merely to defeat them in bettle is not enough. By a war of annihilation, we can deliver a heavy psychological blow to the Soviet people and await, together with the measures mentioned in paragraph 3, their internal collapse. There is no alternative for us. Therefore, from the control of the anti-Soviet war down to the organization, equipment and training of troops, all must be carried out according to the reat principle of a war of annihilation."

Al? that was written by you, Mr. Witness, was

A Yes, I wrote that.

Q Mr. Witness, didn't you plan also the following

NOIL:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the correspinding rages in the record.

24,394

STAHMER

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

K a e a u W

-48

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

HEINRICH STAHMER, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, I now read exhibit 2744. May it be understood that only that part of the exhibit which is read is considered part of the record?

THE PRESIDENT: The parts objected to and disallowed will not be read and will not be part of the record.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There is one paragraph that was not objected to, next to the last page, that I want to eliminate due to the fact that I do not wish to divorce it from its context in the rest of the paragraphs in that subdivision.

THE PRESIDENT: Read everything except the parts disallowed on objection. You may not read any paragraph, or parts thereof, successfully objected t

MR. CUNNINGHAM: By the same token may I eliminate one paragraph that was not objected to?

15 16

17

19 20

21 22

23 24

NOIL:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the correspinding pages in the record.

24,394

STAHMER

Kapleau & Wolf

-48

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.
THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

HEINRICH STAHMER, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, I now read exhibit 2744. May it be understood that only that part of the exhibit which is read is considered part of the record?

THE PRESIDENT: The parts objected to and disallowed will not be read and will not be part of the record.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There is one paragraph that was not objected to, next to the last page, that I want to eliminate due to the fact that I do not wish to divorce it from its context in the rest of the paragraphs in that subdivision.

THE PRESIDENT: Read everything except
the parts disallowed on objection. You may not read
any paragraph, or parts thereof, successfully objected t

MR. CUNNINGHAM: By the same token may
I eliminate one paragraph that was not objected
to?

this subject.

Q How did you come to deal with Military Attache OSHIMA on this question?

MR. TAVENNER: Objection is made, if the Tribunal please, on the ground it is covered in the general examination.

THE PRESIDENT: That is so.

Mr. Blakeney, before you go further, I am asked to put this: How could German knowledge of negotiations between England and the United States be any defense or exculpation of the accused? Knowledge of the accused might be. It may be that when that was drafted Mr. Logan was examining the witness.

I could only suggest that you are charged with conspiring with others, obviously including the Germans, and anything that would tend to exculpate them could be relied upon by you. If I understand the charges rightly, the allgeation of conspiracy is not confined to the Pacific, but extends to Europe. Neuroberg certainly thought the charges before them embraced the Pacific.

MR. BIAKENEY: Shall Mr. Logan answer?
THE PRESIDENT: He can, if he wishes.

MR. LOGAN: In case there is any doubt, your Honor, in the mind of the Judge who asked the question,

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is that correct?

Minister, but I don't know what part he took in the 1 negotiations; I did not talk with him. 2 Did he ever sit in on any of the discussions? 3 No, he was not present. There were always 4 only MATSUOKA and Ott present, and in the end I saw Mr. SAITO and Mr. MATSUMOTO; only for technical, 6 small details, not in the meeting. 8 Did you ever discuss the Tri-Partite Pact 9 in any way whatsoever with the accused? 10 I do not remember. It may be that we talked it over during these dinners and lunches after 12 the signatures to the Pact. Did you have any discussion with him prior to the conclusion of the pact? No, I talked only with MATSUOKA. Do you know how many times Mr. SHIRATORI met Mr. Ribbentrop? He could have met him only during the fiftieth birthday of Hitler, in April 1938 -- 1939. Then you mean they met only once? Only during those two or three days -- I do not know exactly how long he stayed -- In April '39. Then, under the circumstances, Mr. kibben-

trop could not have known Mr. SHIRATORI very well.

A That is correct.

Q With respect to the strengthening of the Anti-Comintern Pact, you state that most of the negotiations were made with Italy through Germany. Will you please explain that, sir.

A During the negotiations in Munich, in September, 1939, Ribbentrop and Hitler talked at first about this idea with Mussolini, and Mussolini agreed immediately, principally, and told them he must think it over when a suitable time would become to go on with these negotiations -- to begin with these negotiations from the side of Italy. As far as I remember, he told that in beginning of January, 1940 -- not 1939.

I was wrong. This was in beginning of 1939.

Q Those negotiations were carried on strictly between Germany and Italy through either Mussolini or Ciano or Ribbentrop or Mr. Hitler, is that correct?

A That is correct. In October, 1938, Ribbentrop again -- Ribbentrop went to Rome and talked again with Mussolini and with Ciano; and later -- at that time Italian Ambassador in Berlin, Attolico, was informed, too, and worked together in these negotiations.

MR. CAUDLE: Thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

0

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

24,517

STAHMER

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CROSS

immediate work, for my work.

Q Well, when you arrived here----

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for 15 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHALL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: I give the judgment of the Tribunel on the defense motion praying for production of witnesses for cross-examination or, alternatively, to strike their affidavits.

The Tribunal will not take into consideration the evidence of Semyonav or Rodzaevsky; accept de bene esse the affidavits of deponents MIYAKE, KUSABE and NOHARA; orders the prosecution to produce for cross-examination the other witnesses mentioned in the said defense motion within a period of two months from this date or within such longer period as may on cause shown be approved by the Tribunal or, alternatively, to give convincing reasons within the said period why, they are not able to produce the said witnesses. The Tribunal will disregard the affidavits of any one or more of the deponents last mentioned in respect of whom the prosecution fails

S t t 8 Y e 1 d

24

25

A I do not know.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Now, in order to show the background for a document which we wish to introduce as an exhibit, and to show the participants in the negotiations on the Tri-Partite Pact which have been described to this witness, I ask that the witness be shown defense document 1664 for identification purposes.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, objection is made to the attempt to introduce a document in redirect examination.

THE PRESIDENT: That alone could be no ground for objection. It would be possible to get in a document on redirect examination, but whether this document can be got in is another question.

MR. TAVENNER: I had not completed my statement, "which is not based upon any evidence in crossexamination."

THE PRESIDENT: It looks like a photograph, and without Mr. Cunningham's help I cannot see how any question put in cross-examination or how any answer given in cross-examination could justify the admission of a document like this, a photograph, in re-examination.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I don't remember saying

3

4

1

5

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

FC

18

19

20

21

23

24

ments away and get it into proper order, we shall probably have no objection, but in its present form it is open to all the objections I have mentioned.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, I think anybody who takes this document and reads it in the order in which it has been arranged will have no difficulty. That is the way I understand it. As I understand it, the documents are arranged in exactly the same way they are arranged in the book from which they were taken.

THE PRESIDENT: Is the book certified to in the usual way?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The book is an official document book of the Japanese Foreign Office, with the certificate attached.

THE PRESIDENT: We are not insisting on copies of the certificates being given to us, but we do went to be satisfied that these things are authenticated as far as they can be. Have you looked at the original, Mr. Carr?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I haven't seen the original. The person who is alleged to have prepared the summary is alive, and surely it must be possible for the defense to get him to show, if the

1 2

rules, of course, which have not been compiled with, I understand.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, I submit that the document has been on file.

THE PRESIDENT: Formerly, you required a specific order of the Court in Chambers, but latterly that was obviated by getting an agreement of the parties, and I understood there was some common understanding about those matters.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, that is my understanding, your Honor, that we deposit the document, or the
book from which it is taken, and if the prosecution
looks it over and wants the rest of it and makes a
demand, that we furnish it. But, it is my submission
that the other features of this document are irrelevant,
and they would not do you any good, and that is the
reason why I have not offered the rest of the document.

THE FRESIDENT: Well, the admission at this stage would appear to need an order in Chambers or an agreement of the parties.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is definitely not my understanding of the rule, your Honor. My understanding is
that if the prosecution makes a demand upon us, that we
give them the balance and not wait until we present it
in court and then objection is made to it and then we

evidence relating to the negotiations that took place at this time, do you still contend that the Japanese -- that the German Embassy in Japan, including yourself, did not know that the war was about to break out between Japan -- that Japan was about to attack the United States and Great Britain?

A I speak first for me, but I think that I can speak at the same time for the embassy. We had at this time, when Ambassedor KURUSU was in Washington, the full impression still that Japan wished to do everything possible to avoid conflict with America, and I, as an officer, could have no understanding at this time for creating a new enemy; that means at a time when the German forces were fighting a very, very hard battle in Russia.

THE PRESIDENT: Were you a general officer?

THE WITNESS: At this time I was a colonel.

I became a colonel in 1942.

Q But Gerrany, with the assistance that you gave it, encouraged Japan to enter into war at the time that Japan should choose by agreeing not to sign a separate peace pact regardless of what the reason for the war between Japan and the United States might be.

A I must express emphatically that I did not

.

NO. L.

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in one record.

24,662

KRETSCHMER

REDIRECT

to the question of the prosecutor, to his government.

THE PRESIDENT: We can allow you to do that only if we disregard the rules agreed upon by yourself and which must be applied to all counsel without discrimination.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: When the rules interfere with the discovery of the facts I sav suspend the rules.

THE PRESIDENT: At all events, for Mr. Cunning-ham's benefit. The objection is upheld and the question disallowed.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: All right. Now the next question.

Q General, did anyone from the Japanese General Staff ever talk with you about operational plans after the outbreak of the Facific War?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, that was matter covered by the examination in chief and the only purpose now is to attempt to have this witness repeat his testimony.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I understood that the prosecution tried to intimate that there was an operational plan in existence and that it was functioning. If they

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

7

10 11

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

22

23

24

peruse all the documents and the recommendations that are made to the documents.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, that is why the prosecution objects to misleading comments upon other parts of the case.

THE FRESIDENT: They offend and provoke, but they do not mislead, rest assured.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, there is no intention to do either, your Honor, and we are only adopting the same procedure which was followed by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: The prosecution did not offend in that respect, nor did other defense counsel -American defense counsel.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I didn't hear that last.

(Whereupon, the statement of the

President was read by the official court
reporter.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I should like to have you particularize, your Honor, if you are making an allegation against me.

THE PRESIDENT: The transcript is your answer.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, by the same token,
that is my only answer to the Tribunal.

I now call attention of the Court to exhibit

1 2

2

5

6

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

18

19

21

23

24

afternoon or tomorrow noon? THE FRESIDENT: It is fixed to begin on the 23d of June. If you finished many days before we would regard the recess commencing as of the time you fin-ished. But don't keep us here just for the sake of giving your colleagues another day's recess. "e will adjourn until half past one. (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I do not wish to argue the matter; I merely wish to read it if it is considered of any value.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal sustains the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: In order to show the lack of any collaboration between Germany and Japan, I would like to tender now defense document 1662, the affidevit of von Ribbentrop, signed by him on the 15th of October, 1946, the day before he was executed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the Tribunal has already rejected interrogations of Fibbentrop and extracts from his evidence before the Nuernberg Tribunal. While this affidavit is, indeed, entitled, "In these proceedings," it was taken under circumstances which obvisouly preclude cross-examination, which is invited by every line of it.

of such a general character that I thought it should be made more specific.

THE FRESIDENT: Well, I take it there will be very little to finish it.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I have been handed a note, your Honor. The SAITO affidavit, and MATSUMOTO affidavit, and document 1656 is all we know now that will be tendered, and I believe that completes the presentation of that phase of the case.

MR. TAVENNER: That answers my question.

At page 24,504 of the transcript I introduced exhibit 2746 which is a statement by Stahmer. I served it upon the defense counsel, and I have the required copies for the Tribunal now.

THE PRESIDENT: Circulate them, please.

MR. TAVENNER: That is all, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Does any other counsel desire to address the Court before we adjourn?

(There was no response.)

THE PRESIDENT: "e will adjourn until half past nine on Monday morning, the 4th of August, next.

(Whereupon, at 1530, an adjournment was taken until Monday, 4 August 1947, at 0930.)

1 2

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

10,939

BALLANTINE

CROSS

Q The message actually was in four parts, was it not?

A Well, I don't recall now.

Q Then you did not read enough of the Japanese copy so that you can confirm or deny that the original Japanese is, in effect, a totally different document from the intercept as it came to you in November, 1941?

A That is correct.

Now, let us turn briefly to the question of non-discriminatory commercial intercourse throughout the Pacific area, this being the third of the major points of difference between the two nations. In order to pass rapidly over the earlier stages of the conversation on this point, may I correctly state that at various times a number of American suggestions for amendment to the various Japanese proposals were accepted -- accepted, I mean, in the sense of being embodied by the Japanese themselves in later draft proposals?

A Some of the wordings were embodied, but they were largely, in effect, nullified by the various qualifications the Japanese put in.

Q For example, the applicability of the mutual guarantees of carrying on economic activity by peaceful means was at first limited in both the Japanese and American versions, was it not, to the Southwest Pacific area?

1 2

A Well, I haven't got the May '31 draft before me. I don't recall definitely what our wording was in our paper.

Q In any event, in the American draft of the 21st of June were not these guarantees for the first time expressed as to be extended to the Pacific area instead of the Southwest Pacific area? I refer to exhibit 1092 in evidence.

A Yes, there the provision is for -- covers the Pacific area.

gettled for some time, did not the Japanese Government by this proposal of the 10th of November make the following statement: "That the Japanese Government recognizes the principle of non-discrimination in international commercial relations to be applied to all of the Pacific areas, inclusive of Chine, on the understanding that the principle in question is to be applied uniformly to the rest of the entire world as well." This is quoted from exhibit 1246 in evidence.

A That is correct.

Q On the same day, in conversation with President Roosevelt, did not Ambassador NOMURA point out to the President that -- I quote -- "The Secretary of State has repeatedly pointed out to me that it has been his

1 2

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the correspinding pages in the record.

20,537

KAWARE					
	70	. 1	**	-	

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

CROSS

I heard that among the lower class officers there was some dissatisfaction but there were no incidents to back this up. Did this Incident occur while Japanese troops were on maneuvers near Fengtai? A Yes, it is as you say. In the settlement of this Incident were the Chinese required to withdraw their troops from Fengtai? Yes, they were forced to withdraw their troops from Fengtai. Then did the Japanese troops occupy Fengtai? THE MONITOR: The witness' previous statement should be just "Yes" and the rest should be deleted. Fengtai had been used as a stationary place for the Japanese before this time. Were the Japanese troops in Fengtai reenforced after the Fengtai Incident?

19

A No, they were not reenforced.

21

23

Q I call your attention to one short paragraph of the testimony of General Ching Teh-chun, deputy commander of the 29th Army in North China, page 2316 of the record.

25

THE MONITOR: Mr. Sutton, what are you

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SUTTON:

Q When did you leave North China?

A In December of 1934.

Q Where were you at the time the so-called Ho-UMEZU agreement was made?

A I was the commander of the 18th Regiment in Kurume at that time.

Q And from whom did you receive your information relative to it?

A I heard directly from General UMEZU at a later date.

MR. SUTTON: I desire to call the Tribunal's attention to the fact that the evidence introduced on behalf of the prosecution with regard to this agreement is the testimony of John Goette, record page 3746 to 3749, the League of Nations Report, Exhibit 58, at page 3,300 in exhibit 2206-A.

There is no further cross-examination.

MR. LEVIN: I submit, Mr. President, that that is not cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: No, it is not, but he did cross-examine. I think he meant that.

MR. LEVIN: I ask that the witness be ex-

3

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

"Collection of Border Treaties between Manchukuo and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic,"
Compiled in July 1943, an official document of the Bureau of Treaties on which defense document 1510 was based. All three Chinese texts were found to be identical. I submit that there can be no doubt that these are accurate copies of the Chinese text since there would be no motive in the powers of any of the three publishers for falsifying the Chinese text and that it should be received by the Tribunal as a copy, the original not being readily available, on what the Court cells "the usual terms."

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, nevertheless the documents mentioned by counsel are not official documents. To show the doubt about the matter there is a difference in the translation between document 1510 and the one now being presented. If the original Chinese text of the treaty is obtained, it may develop that it is similar to one or the others of those presented by the defense.

THE FRESIDENT: Why can't we get the certified copy of the original itself by the person who has the custody of it?

MR. FURNESS: I want to say one thing, your

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

1

0

9

10

13

14

12

15 16

17

13

19 20

21

22

2.4

25

Honor please, is that we have already done it.

THE PRESIDENT: First tell me what is the purpose of introducing this document which has already been introduced? That is an inquiry by one of my colleagues.

MR. FURNESS: It is our contention, if your Honor please, that while the Russian text may be correctly translated, there is a difference between the Russian text and the Chinese text.

THE PRESIDENT: You are suggesting a difference between the originals.

MR. FURNESS: Yes. One is in Russian.

THE PRESIDENT: Is it a mere difference or something that matters?

MR. FURNESS: A real difference, your Honor; the difference between a border.

THE PRESIDENT: That being so, we would require certified copies of the originals by the person who has the custody and including the maps.

MR. FURNESS: We then request the Court to exercise its power, which it said it would, to obtain such document from the Government of China.

THE PRESIDENT: As I said before, how ludicrous for a court like this to act on copies which may be wrong when the originals are available. Rilometers north of the university.

Q How close was the Capital Restaurant to the nearest refugee zone?

A I recall -- I remember it as being about one and a half kilometers.

Q Which was the nearest refugee zone to the headquarters of General MATSUI?

A In my recollection there was only one refugee zone in Nanking.

Q Were all of the 200,000 refugees crowded on this one refugee zone?

A They were in one large area, but they were not crowded.

Q Was Ginling College within the refugee zone to which you refer?

A Yes.

Q How long did General MATSUI remain in Nanking?

A About one week after the capture of Nanking.

Q You state in your affidavit that he arrived on the 17th and left on the 20th. I take it you wish to amend that statement?

A I withdraw the word "one week". I was mistaken. The statement I have made in the affidavit is true.

Q I call your attention to the statement of

2

5

6

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

0

17

19

20

21

22

23

2

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

By the University of Nanking, I presume you to mean Ginling College. Yes, if that is the case. Is that what you mean? I mean the grounds of the University of Nanking, which is distinguished from Ginling College. I have never seen the University of Nanking. Did you have occasion to inspect the grounds of Ginling College, on which--A Yes, twice. On which more than 20,000 women and girls were refugees? I don't know exactly how many women and girls were taking refuge there, but I did see with my own eyes that there were women and girls taking refuge there. At how many places in the city of Nanking did you see dead bodies? A Two places. Did you inspect at night as well as by day? Q A Yes.

21

23

MR. BLAKENEY: I will be glad to tender what counsel calls the title sheet. I have no objection.

sheets of this map and besides we are interested in getting a certificate as to the original source of the map and the place this map was kept in custody. I can't agree with my learned colleague because I am trying to avoid being sensational before further study of the map but I think it necessary to study this map thoroughly and carefully. For this purpose I should have, at any rate, the original of the map tendered for identification, and it is necessary for me to have such photocopies of the document which would enable me to study it carefully by topographical and criminalistic methods.

THE PRESIDENT: They should be allowed to peruse them and they should be tendered for identification, not only the title sheet but all related parts.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: That is all we ask for.

And besides we insist that the defense should produce certificate to this map.

THE PRESIDENT: When they come to tender it, we will have to consider that, certainly.

to sustain his assertions, conclusions and opinions.

Paragraph six is the witness' explanation of kodo in relation to foreign ideology.

Paragraph seven is a statement by the witness of what he terms the vicissitudes of kodo in history and is interspersed with opinions and attempts at elucidation.

Objection is made to the entire affidavit with the exception of paragraph two.

THE PRESIDINT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows, Major General Myron C. Cramer, now sitting:)

attributing anti-American movements and demonstrations in China to Japanese officials or to their influence in thus instigating the Chinese. The Ambassador handed me the attached paper which I proceeded to read. I thanked him for the attention his Government had given to this matter and the spirit seemingly prompting his Government to seek to clear it up.

"I then said that, having seen in the American press the purpose and nature of his contemplated call on me, I had requested the Far Eastern Division to jot down a list of instances of transgressions by Japanese or due to Japanese influence in China to the detriment and injury of Americans and of American interests. I added that this list of incidents had not been elaborated but that I would proceed to read them. I then read the memorandum prepared by the Far Eastern Division attached hereto and marked "A." The Ambassador appeared somewhat surprised and at a loss for further comment with regard to this paper. He said he would be pleased to have a copy of it. I replied that I would be glad to request the Far Eastern Division to put it in more elaborate form if possible and to send a copy to him at the Japanese

20

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

have made the same pronouncement. You see, it is a question of weight. If better evidence is available, and it ought to be, because I think at least one of the Members of the Cabinet is in the dock, we may take the view eventually, as what appears in the press is not supported by those who know -- if that be the case, that the press report is of no value.

The attitude of my colleagues is that they are prepared to accept it as proof or some proof of the resignation of the cabinet, but not of the reasons for its resignation. The objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

We were told that the document was marked for identification only and was not in evidence too. However, I understand it is not in fact in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 710 is now marked admitted into evidence and will receive exhibit No. 2728.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2728 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Reading)

"Statement of Premier HIRANUMA"

"On August 28, the 14th year of Showa

2

5

5

6

8

9

10

12

14

15

1:7

1.8

20

21

22

24